

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 remain pending in this application, of which claim 1 is the sole independent claim. Claims 1, 3 and 4 have been amended. Claim 17 is new. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been introduced by these claim amendments.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for holding a telephone interview with the applicant's undersigned attorney on November 3, 2010. During the interview, the attorney and the Examiner discussed the outstanding obviousness rejection of independent claim 1 in view of Tsuji and Hisatomi. In particular, the Examiner pointed out that the term "specified" on the last line of independent claim 1 has no antecedent basis, and that independent claim 1 as amended appears to overcome the outstanding obviousness rejection based on Tsuji and Hisatomi as well as clarify the claim language.

Independent claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tsuji (US 6,928,234) in view of Hisatomi (US 6,546,192).

In particular, during the interview, the Examiner pointed out that independent claim 1 has been broadly construed as not requiring the recording of the "position information created by said first creator onto said recording medium" every time the reference position is assigned at an intermittent timing, the claim term "assigned" lacking sufficient antecedent basis in independent claim 1. Based on the broad construction, in the Action, the Examiner relied on Tsuji to disclose the recited "second recorder which records the position information created by said first

creator onto said recording medium through an I/F every time that said reference position is specified.”

The applicant hereby amend independent claim 1 to recite “a second recorder which records the position information created by said first creator onto said recording medium every time that said reference position is assigned at said intermittent timing, said reference position being a position of a video frame on which an intra-encoding is performed.”

As discussed during the interview, Tsujii and Hisatomi both fail to disclose or suggest a content recording apparatus in which position information is recorded onto a recording medium every time a reference position is assigned at an intermittent timing, the reference position being a position of a video frame on which an intra-encoding is performed, as now recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that this obviousness rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tsujii in view of Hisatomi.

Claims 2-16 depend from independent claim 1. As noted above, independent claim 1 now recites “a second recorder which records the position information created by said first creator onto said recording medium every time that said reference position is assigned at said intermittent timing, said reference position being a position of a video frame on which an intra-

encoding is performed.” As noted above, Tsuji and Hisatomi both fail to disclose or suggest the same. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the above obviousness rejections be also withdrawn.

Further, claim 17 is new. Support for new claim 17 can be found on page 10, lines 5-7, of the specification. New claim 17 is allowable at least due to its dependency upon independent claim 1.

There are no additional objections or rejections outstanding in this application. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests an early action passing this application to issue as a patent.

In the event that any fees are due in connection with this paper, please charge our Deposit
Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,
KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP



S. Laura Chung
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 59,875

for Mel R. Quintos
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 31,898

MRQ/LC/evb
Atty. Docket No. **060363**
4th Floor
1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time